



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/992,414

11/16/2001

Gil Gavriel Dudkiewicz

051448.0206

1945

7590

05/14/2008

David A. Blumenthal
Foley & Lardner
2029 Century Park East - Suite 3500
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3021

EXAMINER

SALCE, JASON P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2623

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/992,414	Applicant(s) DUDKIEWICZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Jason P. Salce	Art Unit 2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29, 36 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14, 16-18, 20-23, 25-27, 29 and 36-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/21/2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/20/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has amended the independent claims to recite the limitation, “**wherein the categories and the sub-categories are distinct from the programming events**”.

The examiner notes that the claim limitations are broad and that Ellis reads on the amended claim limitation. Figure 13A of Ellis teaches categories and sub-categories that are values added to a user's profile and are not the programming events that are displayed to the user on a television screen. The examiner further notes that Figure 13b of Ellis teaches categories and sub-categories that are also distinct from the programming events, wherein the categories and sub-categories contain identifiers **(name of the genre and genre rating)** that do not list the name of the programming event **(which has been claimed in the new dependent claim 37)**.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 12-14, 16-17, 21-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709).

Referring to claim 12, Ellis discloses a method for creating a viewer profile used for determining programming events of interest to a viewer (**see Figure 13A and Column 14, Lines 35-37**).

Ellis also discloses receiving user navigation commands for navigation among predefined subject matter categories (**see Column 15, Lines 5-9 and Figures 13a-13f**).

Ellis also discloses that the subject matter represented by each of said predefined categories is defined such that the predefined categories together form a hierarchy comprising at least a set of top level categories, respective sets of first level sub-categories each corresponding to and encompassed by a top level category, and respective sets of second level sub-categories each corresponding to and encompassed by a first level sub-category (**see again Figure 13a for sets of top level**

categories (see Figures 13a-13b for the top level categories “Series” and “Genre”), sets of first level sub-categories corresponding to and encompassed by a top level category (see Figure 13a for the first level sub-categories “Frasier” and “Friends”) and sets of second level sub-categories corresponding to and encompassed by a first level sub-categories (see Figure 13a for the second level sub-categories “Strong Like” or “Weak Like”).

Ellis further discloses that said navigation is performed in accordance with said hierarchy (**see Figure 13a and Column 15, Lines 5-20**), wherein the categories and the sub-categories are distinct from the programming events (**Figure 13A of Ellis teaches categories and sub-categories that are values added to a user’s profile and are not the programming events that are displayed to the user on a television screen**).

Ellis further discloses receiving input from the user indicating that a predefined category of the hierarchy to which the user has navigated using said navigation commands is to be added to or deleted from a viewer profile that represents subject matter of interest to the viewer (**see Column 15, Lines 32-34**).

Ellis further discloses receiving qualified keyword input from the user (**see Figure 14 for selecting a qualified keyword from a set of keywords**) associating a keyword supplied by the user (**“narrow”, “wide” or “moderate”**) with a specific category of the category hierarchy to indicate that the keyword describes subject matter of interest to the viewer only when that subject matter is also described by the category associated with the qualified keyword (**see Column 15, Line 60 through Column 16, Line 67 for**

selecting a scope/qualified keyword for each profile, where the qualified keyword selected by the user associates a keyword (*narrow*) with a specific category of the category hierarchy (*the comedy genre*) to indicate that the keyword describes subject matter of interest to the viewer (*My Stepmother is an Alien*) only when that subject matter is also described by the category associated with the qualified keyword (*only when a user sets a profile to narrow*)).

Ellis further discloses storing data representing a plurality of categories indicated by the user as representing subject matter of interest to the viewer and qualified keywords specified by the user in the viewer profile in a computer readable medium (see Column 6, Lines 17-25).

Referring to claim 13, Ellis discloses receiving input from a user specifying a keyword representing subject matter of interest to the viewer (again see Figure 14 for the user selecting the keyword “moderate”, which when assigned by the viewer to a specific profile, becomes a qualified keyword, and further represents the subject matter of interest to present to a user in the electronic program guide screen customized by the user’s preference profile).

Referring to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 13 and further note that the keyword “moderate” represents a score indicating an amount of viewer interest in the subject matter represented by the keyword (“moderate”). See Column 16, Lines 20-39

for the “moderate” representing the amount of viewer interest in certain portions of the viewer’s profile.

Referring to claim 16, Ellis discloses that said input indicates that a predefined category represents subject matter of interest to the viewer comprises a category preference score indicating an amount of viewer interest in subject matter represented by the category (see Figure 13a for a predefined category “Strong Like” indicating an amount of viewer interest in subject matter represented by the category).

Referring to claim 17, Ellis discloses receiving input from a user specifying a priority of said viewer profile relative to other viewer profiles when multiple viewer profiles are used for determining programming events of interest (see Figure 14 for assigning different priorities/scope to different profiles).

Referring to claims 21-23 and 25-26, see the rejection of claims 12-14 and 16-17, respectively.

Referring to claim 36, Ellis discloses that each category and sub-category comprises an identifier that identifies the type of subject matter of at least one event **(see Figure 13a and 13b for each category and sub-category containing identifiers (*the name of the category and the sub-category*) that identifies the type of subject matter of at least one event (*the television programming*)).**

Referring to claim 37, Ellis discloses that each category and sub-category comprises an identifier that identifies the type of subject matter of at least one event without being the at least one event (**Figure 13b of Ellis teaches categories and sub-categories that are also distinct from the programming events, wherein the categories and sub-categories contain identifiers (*name of the genre and genre rating*) that do not list the name of the programming event**).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0251827).

Referring to claim 20, Ellis ('709 patent) discloses all of the limitations in claim 1, but fails to teach receiving input from a user specifying times of day during which the viewer profile is to be used for identifying programming events of interest.

Ellis ('827 Publication) discloses receiving input from a user specifying times of day during which the viewer profile is to be used for identifying programming events of interest (see Paragraph 0105).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the profile creation tool, as taught by Ellis ('709 patent), using the viewer profile time of day option, as taught by Ellis ('827 Publication), for the purpose of provide a user the ability to use multiple sets of parental control settings profiles (see Paragraph 0105 of Ellis ('827 Publication)) in order to prevent children from watching unauthorized video programs.

Referring to claim 29, see the rejection of claim 20.

Claims 18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,065,709) in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0251827) in further view of Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0204387).

Referring to claim 18, Ellis ('709 patent) discloses all of the limitations in claim 1, but fails to teach receiving input from a user specifying times of day during which the viewer profile is to be used for identifying programming events of interest.

Ellis ('827 Publication) discloses receiving input from a user specifying times of day during which the viewer profile is to be used for identifying programming events of interest (see Paragraph 0105).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the profile creation tool, as taught by Ellis ('709 patent), using the viewer profile time of day option, as taught by Ellis ('827 Publication), for the purpose of provide a user the ability to use multiple sets of parental control

settings profiles (see Paragraph 0105 of Ellis ('827 Publication)) in order to prevent children from watching unauthorized video programs.

Although both Ellis references teach defining a profile and assigning the profile to be used at a specified time period, however both Ellis references fail to teach the user specifying a maximum number of alerts to be generated.

Knudson discloses that the user can specify a maximum number of alerts to be generated (see Paragraph 0205).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the profile creation tool and profile time definition tool, as taught by the Ellis references, to utilize the option to allow a user to specify the maximum number of alerts to be generated, as taught by Knudson, for the purpose preventing the receiver memory to become saturated/full with a large portion of reminders, thereby negatively impacting system performance.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason P. Salce whose telephone number is (571) 272-7301. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on (571) 272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason P Salce/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Jason P Salce
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2623

May 11, 2008